

REMARKS

Preliminarily, Applicant thanks the Examiner and her supervisor for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 6, and for the interview conducted on December 22, 2004. The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks below.

Turning to the Office Action, all of pending claims 1-7 have been rejected based on prior art. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feister (U.S. Patent No. 452,933) in view of Yasuo (EP 0 895 183) and Garber (U.S. Patent No. 3,593,987). The Examiner has also issued a new rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feister in view of Yasuo and Garber, as applied to claims 1-5, and further in view of newly-cited Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,291,227).

The independent claims have been amended to recite printing bodies of text with a symmetrical distribution with respect to a centre of symmetry of a sheet being printed, and likewise, symmetrically with respect to two axes of symmetry, which pass through the centre of symmetry and which are parallel with outer edges of the sheet. The Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor acknowledged during the interview that the applied prior art does not suggest this feature. Thus, the prior art rejections are believed to be overcome for at least this reason.

Also, the Examiners stated during the interview that the amendments to the independent claims, if first filed in an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 without filing a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), would be denied entry as requiring further search and consideration. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has filed the Amendment immediately with the RCE. Because of the Examiners' comments that the claim amendments require further search and consideration, under no circumstances should the next action by the Examiner be an Office Action that is final.

With further regard to claim 3, none of the applied references suggests the adjustment of parameters determining the bodies of text and the arrangement thereof on a sheet being effected by an electronic controller, which is externally operated, without stopping the continuous process of

manufacture. The present invention uses digital means to print text and images dynamically. That is, the present invention makes it possible to sequentially print groups of pages (in sheets that are folded) having a variable number of pages and a variable page size without it being necessary to stop the printing machine to adapt or adjust the machine for a new book or sheet size, as is necessary in the printing processes of the prior art. It is therefore possible to change size and content in order to obtain, unit by unit, different products in a continuous printing flow, without it being necessary to stop for intermediate manual adjustments when changing the type of printed products. This feature is not shown in the applied prior art, which is directed to only one type of product regarding shape (book, letter, bill, catalogue, manual, leaflet) or binding type (paperback, secured, stapled). The claimed invention has a huge impact on the economy of the printing process and its commercial possibilities. It is possible to decentralize the printing process, thus solving the logistical problems of world-wide distribution. Also, the printing process becomes more economically feasible without the necessity of a minimum number of units to print.

Neither Feister nor Garber involves digital technology. Since it is impossible to achieve the claimed dynamic variability without digital technology, Feister and Garber clearly do not suggest this feature. And Yasuo uses a fixed printing criterion for paperback binding. Thus claim 3 is patentable over the applied prior art for these additional reasons.

Regarding dependent claim 7, the Examiner additionally applies Suzuki as allegedly teaching a sheet being arranged with its edge displaced with respect to a reference edge of a base carrying the sheet, and printing being effected in accordance with coordinate axes of the base, to produce a lateral edge for gripping. See Suzuki col. 5, lines 64-68, and Fig. 8. However, Suzuki does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references. Thus claim 7 is patentable over the applied prior art at least by virtue of its dependence on claim 1.

